

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/675,323	09/28/2000	Henry A. Lardy	HOLISED.063A	HOLISED.063A 2363	
26551 7590 08/22/2006			EXAMINER		
	DEN PHARMACEU GATE MALL	PESELEV, ELLI			
SUITE 400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
SAN DIEGO	), CA 92121	1623			
			DATE MAILED: 09/2/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/675,3	23	LARDY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary			<u> </u>	Art Unit				
		Elli Pesel	ev	1623				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENE WHICHEVER - Extensions of tim after SIX (6) MON - If NO period for re - Failure to reply w Any reply receive	ED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL e may be available under the provisions of 3 NTHS from the mailing date of this communiceply is specified above, the maximum statutishin the set or extended period for reply will, d by the Office later than three months after m adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THE ST CFR 1.136(a). In no every cation.  Dry period will apply and we, by statute, cause the apply and we apply	HIS COMMUNICATION ent, however, may a reply be tim fill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to flication to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed he mailing date of this communic 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
2a) ☐ This act 3) ☐ Since th	sive to communication(s) filed of ion is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) is application is in condition for accordance with the practice	☐ This action is rallowance except	for formal matters, pro		ts is			
Disposition of CI	aims							
4a) Of th 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8) ☐ Claim(s)  Application Pape 9) ☐ The spec 10) ☐ The draw Applicant Replacer	above claim(s) 33-39 and 70 is/are allowed.  56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69 is/are objected to.  is/are subject to restriction  are subject to by the Eving(s) filed on is/are: a/a may not request that any objection nent drawing sheet(s) including the or declaration is objected to by	lare rejected.  If and/or election research is accepted or b) accepted or b) in to the drawing(s) is ecorrection is required.	vn from consideration.  equirement.  objected to by the Ender the decident of the drawing of the	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.1				
Priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>								
	person's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- losure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC		4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	e				

Application/Control Number: 09/675,323

Art Unit: 1623

Upon further consideration the Final Rejection of June 23, 2006 is hereby withdrawn in order to introduce a new ground of rejection.

The provisional rejection of claims 56-59, 61, 63-65 and 67-69 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claim 15 of the copending Application No. 10/319,356 is withdrawn.

Claims 33-39 and 70-79 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on December 8, 2003. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Examples 2-5 on page 80 of the specification are directed to figures. However, the specification does not contain a section titled "Brief Description of Drawings" and no Figures have been presented.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 56-59, 61, 63-65, 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for compound 10 as set forth on page 78 of the specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for the steroid compounds as encompassed by the present claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use and make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means, based on the evidence regarding each of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would

Art Unit: 1623

not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

(A) The nature of the invention.

The claims are directed to the treatment of androgen responsive prostate cancer or androgen responsive benign prostatic hyperplasia or amelioration of one or more symptoms thereof by administration of a large number of steroid derivatives.

(B) The predictability or lack thereof in the art.

Chang et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA Vol. 96, Issue 20, 11173-11177, September 28, 1999), submitted by applicants disclose that among 22 derivatives of dehydroepiandrosterone, only 4 steroids were found that have no androgenic activity and could also block the Adiol-induced AR transactivation in prostate cancer PC-3 cells (see, for example, the Abstract). Therefore, Chang et al show that there is great unpredictability in activities of various derivatives of dehydroepiandrosterone.

(C) The presence or absence of working example.

There is a single working example directed to a compound wherein one or R5 or R6 is a carbonate (compound 10 set forth on page 78 of the specification.

(D) The breadth of the claims.

The claims encompass a very large number of species. Note that the claims encompass a large variation in variables R5, R6, R12, R13, R16, R17, R18, R19 and R15. It is noted that the claims have been limited to compounds wherein R5 or R6 is a carbonate. The specification discloses a single species of a compound wherein R5 or R6 is a carbonate and that is a compound 10 as set forth on page 78 of the

specification. Note that "in applications directed to inventions in arts where the results are unpredictable, the disclosure of a single species usually does not provide an adequate basis to support generic claims" (MPEP 2164.03)

The claims encompass an immense number of species.

(E) The quantity of experimentation needed.

Chang et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA Vol. 96, Issue 20, 11173-11177, September 28, 1999) disclose that among 22 derivatives/metabolites of dehydroepiandrosterone, only 4 steroids were found that have no androgenic activity and could block the Adiol-induced AR transactivation in prostate cancer PC-3 cells (see, for example, the Abstract). Because there is no way to predict a priori which compounds will be active from the specification or chemical structures alone, an extraordinary amount of trial and error experimentation is required to identify the active compounds.

Claim 58 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Note that claim 57 is already limited to the structure set forth in claim 58.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

Application/Control Number: 09/675,323

Art Unit: 1623

. .

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 56-59, 61, 63-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a and f) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chang et al (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA Vol. 96, Issue 20, 11173-11177, September 28, 1999).

Chang et al disclose 10, 3-methylcarbonate-androst-5-ene-7, 17-dione having no androgenic activity but being able to block the Adiol-induced AR transactivation in prostate cancer PC-3 cells and being potential therapeutic drug for prostate cancer see, for example the ABSTRACR and DISCUSSION). Based on the disclosure by Chang et al, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made would have envisaged the treatment of prostate cancer with the claimed compound.

Application/Control Number: 09/675,323

Art Unit: 1623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Jiang can be reached on (571) 272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Elli Peselev

ELLI PESELEV PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1200

Page 6